



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ample, of even the smallest and simplest architectonic forms. Lipps also reminds us in this connection that the infinite wealth of our emotional life is not exhausted by the monotonous antithesis of pleasure and pain. A mere pleasure-pain psychology cannot reach the essence of æsthetic feeling. He also repudiates the attempts of the psychologists who seek to reduce all æsthetic feelings to bodily and organic sensations.

The publishers of the work deserve credit for the excellent way in which they have solved the technical problems of this great enterprise, for the fine typography, the good paper, printing and binding. The volume is supplied with a table of contents and an index. Bibliographical references are appended to the different papers, but they are as a rule very unsatisfactory. In a work of this kind which is intended for the general reader, well-selected lists of books would prove very helpful, and the value of the different contributions would have been enhanced by the insertion of completer bibliographies. This, however, is a defect that can be remedied in future editions, and it is to be hoped that the publishers will insist on its being done.

FRANK THILLY.

Cornell University.

THE KEY TO THE WORLD'S PROGRESS. By Charles Stanton Devas. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1906.

It is an ungracious task to criticise this book. Its author is evidently informed by a deeply religious spirit. He is also well and honorably known as a writer on economic questions. His historical knowledge, if neither very critical nor very accurate, has at least a wide sweep and is not defaced by violent or uncharitable prejudice. Yet his book from beginning to end is a distortion of history all the more gross that it is apparently quite unconscious and sincere. Far from being a key to the world's progress, it is the demonstration that the actual world has not followed the true line of progress, that it has proved itself a refractory lock into which the key will by no means fit.

"We need," says Mr. Devas, "an imperial theory of history." Nothing can be more true. But nothing can be less imperial than the theory he has provided. It is provincial in the last degree, and even in the short time which has elapsed since his

book was written, events have happened to rob his theory of its whole significance for even that petty and ever-dwindling province to which it refers. Verbally, at least, the theory of Mr. Devas is that the history of the Church of Christ is the key to world history, that "church history is all important for the understanding of universal history and for our mental outfit." Really it is that the key to world-history is to be found in the history of the Roman Church. But even this is too liberal an interpretation of his actual thesis. For the Roman Church of which he speaks and thinks throughout is the Roman Church which is identical with the present mood and form of authority within that church. It is the church expressing its mind and will through the medium provided and sanctioned by the Vatican Decrees of 1870 that for Mr. Devas is alone divine, that is the Christian Church which has worked throughout the ages as the divine leaven in the world-lump. This conception of the Christian Church has made the development of Mr. Devas' thesis tolerable perhaps as a piece of sectarian apologetic, but utterly untrustworthy as a guide to the reading of history.

The irritation which one feels with this book is due to the fact that it has wantonly missed its mark. If Mr. Devas had only taken the religious experience of the Roman Church as representative of all other religious experience instead of making it exclusive and peculiar, he would have succeeded in his aim. The picture which he has drawn of the Roman communion has indeed a certain faithfulness to fact; but that picture would correspond, with the same kind of faithfulness, to the history of any other Christian communion, indeed we may say of any religious society whatsoever. It may be natural, while the *odium theologicum* inspires our estimates of the religious value of different religious societies, that the apologist of each communion should quite honestly claim for it a monopoly of divine guidance and divine truth. But the facts of history will repudiate his claim. He remains an apologist merely, and must renounce all right to the title of historian.

The larger and more important section of Mr. Devas' book is devoted to the study of the antinomies presented by the history of the church, as he understands the church. The church appears to oppose intellectual civilization and yet fosters it; appears to oppose material civilization and yet fosters it; teaches a morality which is austere and yet joyful; is the rival

and yet the ally of the state; upholds the equality of men and yet the inequality of property and power; is full of scandals and yet all-holy; upholds and yet opposes religious freedom and liberty of conscience; is one and yet has to endure the fact of a divided Christendom; is ever the same yet ever changing; is ever being defeated yet ever victorious. Now of some of these antinomies it may be said that they are characteristic of all societies whatsoever, whether religious or not, while the others are specially characteristic of all religious societies. Indeed one feels that this book is neither a contribution to the understanding of general history nor even an effective apology for the Roman Church, but merely an essay in the psychology of human associations founded on the history of the church as seen from a special, and that a very narrow, point of view. The Church of Rome presents most of the antinomies which Mr. Devas enumerates simply because it is a society and not because it is a specially divine society. Every society remains the same and yet is always changing, is marked by victory and defeat throughout its life. And as to the latter antinomy, it is impossible for the historian, while the society still exists, to strike the balance or to declare the issue. The greatest victory of the society may be that which it procures by its own death, by the ultimate sacrifice of its phenomenal existence. As Mr. Tyrrell, whom Mr. Devas is fond of quoting in support of his own position, has said with regard to the destiny of the Catholic Church itself: "May not Catholicism, like Judaism, have to die in order that it may live again in a greater and grander form? Has not every organism its limit of development, after which it must decay and be content to survive in its progeny?"

And again, is not every society, by its very constitution, the enemy and yet the ally of progress, intellectual or material? A society comes into existence for the very purpose of giving effect to some new aspect of truth or utility, of working out that aspect to its logical conclusion. And by this limitation of its aim it is forced into an attitude of hostility to every new aspect of truth or utility as alien or conflicting, though again the exigencies of its continued life will force it, equally on behalf of that aim, to make terms with such aspects as they appear. Instinctively it resists progress; of necessity it accepts it.

But it may be admitted that some of these antinomies are specially characteristic of the Roman Church. The admission,

however, contributes little to our understanding of her history as the key to the world's progress. The church, for instance, has been the rival and yet the ally of the state. The rival certainly, and often the jealous and hostile rival just where jealousy and hostility to the state were least inspired by purely religious interests. As to the alliance, it might be necessary, before pronouncing a verdict upon its value to the world's progress, to scrutinize its conditions. The truth is that there are few more discreditable pages in history than those which chronicle the relations of church and state in the West, and that the balance of discredit does not lie with the state. The ideal of the Roman Church is still the medieval theocracy, and that ideal has always been more disastrous to the interest of religion than the common sense of mankind has ever allowed it to be to the interests of the secular community. The fact of history is that the church would have suppressed the state at all times, would have made it an obedient slave to its own theocratic absolutism, and could never learn to be satisfied with trusting it to prove its own independent religious and moral inspiration. It is just in the countries of the Roman obedience that the state has become most notably atheistic, and that through the necessity of resisting these absurd and intolerable claims.

The real antinomy disclosed in Mr. Devas' pages is daily and with increasing rapidity being resolved quite otherwise than he thinks. It is the antinomy not of the church and the world, not even of the Roman Church and all other world-forces, but of the Roman Church committed to a certain view of authority and all actual world-forces whatever, including forces which are alive and vigorous at this hour in the Roman Church itself. And all these forces have, in obedience to the inexorable dictates of life and development, rejected once and for all the view of authority which Rome has inherited from Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Boniface VIII. The resolution of the conflict, therefore, is not doubtful; it is already assured. If the religious witness of Rome is to be preserved to the world, Rome must submit in this matter of authority to the terms which the progressive forces of the world are in a position to dictate, which indeed they must dictate in obedience to an inspiration which is more divine than a medieval conception of authority already outworn, henceforth obsolete.

Yet the religious witness of Rome will not be lost, for the simple reason that no witness to truth is ever lost. And such witness Rome has preserved and still preserves in spite of the almost impossible conditions on which she insists for its preservation. One thing is certain, however, *viz.*, that the same religious witness is being preserved more effectually, if perhaps also in a more fragmentary form, by other Christian societies which have not imposed on themselves the same disastrous disabilities. Rome may boast of her integral witness to religion. But what avails its integral character if she cannot bring it near to the world's heart and will? The real antinomies of life are not resolved by a conflict between two imaginary societies "of good and evil all compact," the church and the world. They can be resolved only through the conflict of two undeniably universal forces—the real church and the real world, the divine-human and the human that would ignore its own constitutive divine inspiration—in each human heart and in every association, whatever its immediate aim, of human hearts and wills. And the Spirit which alone can achieve this resolution "bloweth where it listeth," and not only in the religious preserve of the Roman Church, where indeed it is just now sore let and hindered by impossible conditions.

A. L. LILLEY.

London.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMON SENSE. By Frederic Harrison. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1907. Pp. xxxvii, 433.

In the war which raged between science and religion from about 1850 to 1880, it seemed that no quarter could be given, and that, in spite of mediators, peace could only come from the unconditional surrender of one or the other party. The fact of its having been a bold, though unsuccessful attempt to intervene in this war constitutes the chief interest and significance of Positivism; and the papers collected in this volume by Mr. Frederic Harrison, the most eminent and venerable representative of the movement, are full of the clash of heroic fights, now almost forgotten. For the arena is empty both of combatants and spectators. Terms have been made somehow, though not at all under the influence of Mr. Harrison and Comte. Whatever the faults of the settlement proposed by the Positivists, it